(SRI K. PUTTASWAMY)

Sir, on behalf of the Minister for Education I lay the Second Annual Report of the Bangalore University for the year ending 31st March 1967 under sub-section (2) of section 43 of the Bangalore University Act, 1964.

Sri M. RAJASHEKARA MURTHY (Minister for Industries, Information and Publicity).—Sir, I beg to lay the Accounts of the Mysore State Khadi and Village Industries Board and its Direct Trading Units for the year 1964-65 and Audit Report thereon under section 26 of the Mysore Khadi and Village Industries Act, 1956.

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—Sir, on behalf of the Minister for Revenue, I lay the Statement showing the particulars of fallow and cultivable waste lands in respect of Coondapur, Udipi and Karkala Taluks as directed by the Chair on 9th December 1967 in pursuance to answers for L.A. Question No. 26 (13) by Smt. Winnifred F. Fernandes.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Papers are laid on the Table.

Sri H. SIDDAVEERAPPA.—Sir, I would like to know whether these papers are actually on the Table or are they only read ?

Sri K. PUTTASWAMY.—May I submit to this Hon'ble House, that these papers are actually laid on the Table of the House ?

PETITION ABOUT CONSTRUCTION OF NEW TANKS NEAR GAYATRI RESERVOIR

(*Presentation*)

Sri B. GANGANNA.—Sir, on a point of order. As per rule 311 (2), the contents of the petition obstructs the construction of tanks which has already been approved in the budget and it may lead to the contempt of the House. Therefore, I object to the presentation of this petition by Mr. Mallappa regarding construction of new tanks in the catchment area of Gayatri Reservoir.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Now if it amounts to contempt of this House, then it is for the member concerned to take the consequences. As the item is on the agenda we shall take it up.

Sri B. GANGANNA.—Sir, I request the Hon'ble Chair to get a brief report of the department concerned and place it before this House during this session only.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The petition will come up before the Committee on Petitions for its consideration. Hon'ble member may make his submission to the Committee on this matter.

Sri M. MALLAPPA.—Sir, I beg to present a petition submitted by Sri H. L. Puttalingappa and four others about the construction of new tanks in the catchment area of Gayatri Reservoir.

Mr. SPEAKER.—The petition is presented. It will be referred to the Committee on petitions for a report.

THE MYSORE URBAN DEVELOPMENT BOARD BILL, 1967

Motion to Continue

† Sri M. NAGAPPA.—I raise to a point of order, Sir. This Bill is not on the Register and I think that this Bill has lapsed for the following reasons:—

The first reason is, that according to the Bill that has been furnished to us, it has been published on 15th July 1967. After the publication of this Bill there were two sessions of this House, one in the month of December 1967 and the other in the month of February 1968. So, in these two sessions, the Hon'ble Minister has not submitted to this House that he was intending to bring such a Bill on the floor of the House or to move for consideration of the Bill. When two successive sittings were over, if any Bill that has not been brought on the floor of the House either for introduction or for consideration, definitely that Bill stands lapsed. Of course, if you see the rules, rules are silent. But there is a practice and convention so far as the House of Commons is concerned. Every Bill that was placed on the Table of the House for consideration, or introduction, will be deemed to be lapsed immediately after the prorogation or dissolution of the House. Here, if it is taken for consideration it would not lapse, but it will continue. In this case, this Bill has been submitted originally in the year 1966 and the same has been referred to a Select Committee. Later on, the House was dissolved. Therefore the Bill lapsed. Again the Bill was published as I have said in the month of July 1967. Therefore in the two successive sessions, the Government have not claimed or requested this House or taken the permission of this House that they were intending to continue this Bill.

I will quote from the rules of procedure from S. S. Morey's book on Page 393 which reads as follows:—

> "If for two successive sittings, if the member in charge of the Bill or the Minister concerned failed to introduce that Bill or claim for the continuation of the said Bill, then that Bill is deemed to be lapsed and it cannot be taken up for consideration."

It has also been supported by Mr. Mukherjea on page 185, in the books which are concerned with the parliamentary procedures. Both are unanimous in this matter, that if the Bills are submitted before the House for two successive sessions and no permission or leave of the House was asked, then the Bill lapses. Therefore Sir, this Bill cannot be taken up for consideration.